

# the organized farmer

Vol. 26

February 15, 1965, Edmonton, Alberta

No. 5

## Executive Assistant Visits Northern Alberta Farmers

Expanding farm settlement in Northern Alberta along the MacKenzie Highway has opened up a new area for F.U.A. organization.

To study the merits of setting up another district to give farm families in the area direct representation, Executive Assistant Doug Galbraith travelled to High Level, Rocky Lane, Ft. Vermilion, La Crete, and Keg River last week.

The F.U.A. Provincial Board had commissioned the study.

After attending a two-day seminar on farm organization at Manning, Mr. Galbraith proceeded north. He found wide-spread interest in the work of the F.U.A., and came back convinced that there is potential for a very substantial organization in this district.

Some of the drawbacks which

## JUNIOR DEBATE AREAS SPLIT INTO FOUR

Again this year the Jr. F.U.A. is sponsoring a debating contest. Any two young people between the ages of 14-27 who are members of the FUA, FWUA or Jr. FUA may enter as a debating team. However, anyone who has already won in this debating contest, cannot enter it again.

Entries for each team must be in Head Office before March 13th, 1965. The topics that each team is to debate will be sent from Head Office. Each team will play off at the local level before March 31, district level before April 30th. Regional level before June 10th. Winners of each of the four regions will then go to Goldeye lake for the Jr. Convention which is on the 1st and 2nd of July for the semi final and finals, the semi finals being held on July 1st, and the finals July 2nd. The two teams gaining the highest points in the semi-finals will debate for the finals. It may not necessarily be the two winners of the semi-finals.

The four regions are No. 1 — 1, 2, 3; No. 2 — 4, 5, 6, 7; No. 3 — 8, 9, 10, 11; and No. 4 — 12, 13, 14.

Topics are chosen for each debate as well as who is to be affirmative or negative. The negative will have to travel to the affirmative for the debate. The affirmative will have to get judges for the debate as well as a place to hold the debate. The two teams will have to contact each other for a date to hold the debate. When the topics are sent out, the teams will be told who their opponents will be.

Prizes for the winning team will be a trip to Saskatchewan Farm Young Peoples' Week at Fort Quappelle at Valley Centre, and a trophy as well. The second prize will be a cash award. The four teams that go to Goldeye for the semi-finals and finals will each receive plaques for souvenirs of the event.

## FU & CDA Policy Council Reviews Research Report

The report on the survey of Farmer Attitudes in Alberta is to receive its first examination at the Farmers' Union and Co-operative Development Association Policy Council meeting in Edmonton February 15th.

FU & CDA commissioned this province-wide study in 1963. It was completed under the guidance of Dr. L. B. Doscher of New York late in 1964. In all, more than 1000 farmers were interviewed.

Information gathered in the report will be used by FU & CDA in planning future rural adult education programs.

This is the first time such a comprehensive study has been carried out by an Alberta farm group.

Key questions to be considered by the Policy Council (made up of heads of all sponsoring farm organizations) is whether or not the report should be released to the public, and if so in what form.

FU & CDA's Advisory Committee will also be meeting in Edmonton, Feb. 15th. This body will be considering the program of the farm organization's education arm for the next quarter.



Doug Galbraith

will be encountered in organizing the area centre on relatively long lines of communication needed. However, Mr. Galbraith feels, if the people apply the same kind of determination to this as they have to the building of successful farming ventures in the district, there is no question but that these organizational difficulties can be overcome.

## Dr. Irene Parlby Celebrates 97th Year

by Edna L. Walker

On Saturday, January 9th, 1965, one of Alberta's most prominent women, celebrated her 97th birthday. Beloved by the farm women of Alberta, Irene Parlby has earned their respect and love. She was the second president of the women's auxiliary of the United Farmers of Alberta in 1916 and when the women's section was formed, served for three years as its president, and was instrumental in bringing about many changes that greatly benefitted women.

In 1921, when the U.F.A. went into politics, Mrs. Parlby was elected to the Alberta Legislature by the Lacombe constituency and remained in office until 1935. During that time she was appointed minister without portfolio, a position she very capably filled. While in public office, the Hon.

Irene Parlby visited, on behalf of the provincial government, the Scandinavian countries to study their school system and the co-operatives in existence there. In 1930 she was appointed as a representative to the League of Nations session in Geneva. It was almost entirely due to the efforts of the Hon. Irene Parlby and four other Alberta women that in 1928, women were declared to be persons and therefore eligible for appointment to the Senate.

### Early Years

Irene Parlby was born Mary Irene Marryat back in 1868, daughter of Colonel Ernest Lindsay Marryat and his wife, Margaret. As Colonel Marryat, while serving in the Royal Engineers, was stationed in northern India, Mary Irene spent part of her childhood in the Far East before returning to England for her education. She further studied in Switzerland and Germany before coming to Canada in 1896 to visit a friend, Mrs. Charles Westhead, who was the first white woman settler in the area west of Buffalo Lake, situated in what was then the North West Territories.

Mary Irene was destined to meet and marry Walter C. H. Parlby, who, with his brother Edward, had emigrated from Devonshire, England and settled in that part of Central Alberta in 1890. They had one son, Humphrey who still farms in Alix. Following her retirement due to ill health, Mrs. Irene Parlby was honored by the University of Alberta by the conferring of the degree of Doctor of Laws upon her.

For the past 16 years Mrs. Parlby has lived at Dartmoor Ranch, Alix. To Dr. Parlby on her birthday, the F.W.U.A. sends a bouquet of flowers as a minute "thank you" for all she has done for all of us. A fund has also been set up called the Dr. Irene Parlby Scholarship Fund and each year the girl showing the greatest achievement record in any of the courses offered at each of the three agricultural colleges in Alberta receives a \$50 scholarship. There are several ways that this fund is kept active. One of the nicest ways, is to send in a donation in memory of one of our active farm women who has Gone Before. By so doing, you will be assured that the lady's name will be entered in the Dr. Irene Parlby Scholarship Fund Donation Book and dedicated at our memorial service at the annual convention.

## Study Farm Organization



RESOURCE CHAIRMEN: Harold E. Chapman, (left), Principal of Western Co-op College, Saskatoon and Alf Peterson of the University of Alberta Department of Extension acted as co-chairmen and resource persons for a Conference on Farm Organization February 5 in Edmonton. The conference, called by the F.U.A. to study ways and means of having the Report on Farm Organization widely studied and discussed by farm people and community leaders, brought together about 30 farm and co-op leaders for the all-day session. The conference agreed that the information in the Committee Report on Farm Organization should be made fully available to the farm people. It recommended that the executive of the F.U.A. and of the A.F.A. meet to formulate initial plans on how and when this information should be disseminated.

## New Machinery Act In Planning Stage

According to Provincial Government sources, Alberta will be getting a new Farm Machinery Act.

The FUA has been asked by the Government to submit proposed amendments which it feels would make the Act of more use to Alberta farmers.

In consultation with FUA legal advisors, the Farmers' Union is drafting such proposals. A prime aim of the re-written Act would be to clear up parts of the old legislation which have often led to misunderstandings in the past.

It has often proved impossible for purchasers of farm implements to be absolutely sure of proper warranty protection. Warranties

responsibilities are not now clearly enough defined, farmers feel.

Another deficiency in the old Act has been its ambivalence regarding the availability of spare parts. The FUA is insisting that the Act spell out responsibility for maintenance of sufficient repair stocks in centralized depots.

FUA President Paul Babey extends congratulations to the Minister of Agriculture, and other members of the Cabinet for placing this matter high on the Government list of priorities. Says Mr. Babey, "An effective new Farm Machinery Act will be a blessing for the farmers, and the FUA office staff as well. Presently, considerable time is spent at Central Office annually in attempting to settle complaints and redress grievances which have arisen because of the inadequacies of the old Act."

## FARMERS TREATED LIKE SEPARATE CLASS — BABEY

Paul Babey, President of the FUA has issued a statement February 8th which calls upon the Provincial Government to consider again farm organization requests for new voting regulations in the Agricultural Products Marketing Act.

"Changes to the Act will be dealt with during the next session of the Alberta Legislative Assembly. And farm organizations are opposed to the totally undemocratic and unjust regulations governing marketing board plebiscites. Yet, the government does not propose to change these voting regulations, which will make

any other improvements to the Act virtually worthless.

"I resent the fact that farmers, under the provisions of the present Act, are conceived of as a class apart from their fellow citizens. In our society, we are normally governed by the decision of the majority of those who show their interest by casting a ballot. It is impossible for me to understand that in a farmer plebiscite, those who do not vote at all are added to those voting in opposition. Such a regulation does not apply to any other group in this Province," Mr. Babey stated. The FUA is objecting to pro-

visions in the Agricultural Products Marketing Act which insists that at least 51% of all those eligible must signify approval before any compulsory marketing board plan can be put into operation in Alberta.



## FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA

9934 - 106 St., Edmonton, Alta.  
Phone 424-0375  
After 5:00 p.m. 489-6955

### the organized farmer

EDITOR — KEN NELSON  
Subscription — \$1.00 a year  
Authorized Second Class Mail,  
Post Office Department, Ottawa,  
and for payment of postage in cash  
FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA  
9934 - 106 St., F.U.A. Bldg.,  
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

## And Now . . . Sunflowers

The introduction of higher oil yielding varieties from Russia has revived sunflower production in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Over 35 thousand acres of this crop was harvested in Saskatchewan and Alberta last year.

Sunflowers have the greatest potential in the drier areas of the prairie, especially where the wheat-summerfallow-wheat rotation is the most common. They do well on stubble and offer a chance for good weed control while cutting down on the amount of summer-fallow.

Sunflowers can be seeded as a row crop, solidly or in widely spaced rows with summerfallow in between. It is this latter method that holds the great potential for areas where farmers summer-fallow every other year.

Peredovick is the main variety being grown. Like most Russian varieties it has an oil content of

President of Federated Co-operatives Ltd., L. L. Lloyd, of Saskatoon, in his address to the F.C.L. convention February 2 in Saskatoon, charged the Retail Merchants' Association with opposing the co-op movement for over 60 years.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the real reason for these attacks had always been because of the "determination of certain groups to hold consumers captive to a form of business ac-

tivity designed for making profits for themselves." He said that this was true today, in spite of the fact that the anti-co-op campaign is presently concerned with alleged tax advantages of co-ops. The F.C.L. president said he was fed up with these attacks, and that the true extent of taxes paid by co-ops is not being admitted by opponents of co-operatives. A summation of Mr. Lloyd's address follows on page 3.

## JUNIOR FARM LEADER OF THE YEAR CONTEST

After a successful initiation last year the Junior F.U.A. are again sponsoring a Junior Farm Leader of the Year Contest.

The contest is open to young men and women between the ages of 18 and 27 years, who are members of the Junior F.U.A., F.W.-U.A., or F.U.A. Members of the provincial board are not eligible.

Each local may submit one entry and must be willing to sponsor their candidate to the Junior annual meeting at Goldeye Lake where the contestants will be judged. Applicants should be active in community affairs, be good speakers, have a wide knowledge of farm practices and a broad

about 45 per cent compared to 35 per cent for Canadian varieties.

A breeding program is in progress at Lethbridge to develop a variety with a high oil content that would be earlier maturing than Peredovick.

Diseases and pests reduce agricultural production by nearly \$1.4 billion dollars annually.

knowledge of current affairs especially those related to agriculture.

### WINNER LAST YEAR



Miss Carol Szymanek

## Feed Grain Urgently Required

by

### CO-OP FEED PLANT

12629 Fort Road,  
Edmonton, Alberta

For information contact:  
Walter Nicolai at 477-1147  
between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.

## THER'VE BEEN SOME CHANGES MADE!

### ATTENTION JUNIOR MEMBERS:

It has been announced by the Jr. Debates Committee, that the semi-finals for the provincial debating contest have been split into 4 zones, instead of 3.

These new zones are:

1. F.U.A. Districts 1, 2, 3
2. F.U.A. Districts 4, 5, 6, 7
3. F.U.A. Districts 8, 9, 10, 11
4. F.U.A. Districts 12, 13, 14.

Any two young people between the ages of 14 and 27 years who are members of the FUA, FWUA, or Junior FUA may enter as a team.

Locals entering a team will play off in district competition and the winner from the district will go on to the regional playoffs. The winners from each region will debate at the Junior annual meeting at Gold Eye Lake on July 3rd and 4th, 1965.

We hope all locals will try to get a team to debate. Those entering the contest, please fill out the application form below and return to Central Office by **March 13, 1965**. Debating rules and procedures will be mailed when applications are received.

CLIP AND MAIL TO:

### JR. F.U.A. DEBATING COMPETITION

c/o Farmers' Union of Alberta  
9934 - 106 Street, Edmonton, Alta.

NAME.....  
ADDRESS.....  
AGE..... PHONE NUMBER.....  
NAME.....  
ADDRESS.....  
AGE..... PHONE NUMBER.....  
SUBSTITUTE NAME.....  
ADDRESS.....  
AGE..... PHONE NUMBER.....  
Sponsoring Local.....  
Local Number.....  
Secretary.....  
Address.....

## MISSING MEMBERS

Don't wait any longer . . .  
use Application Form below:

### SORRY I'M LATE!

Please renew my unit membership for the 1964-65 membership year.  
(List yourself, wife, and all children between 14-21 years of age)

Name Address Local

PLEASE FIND ENCLOSED \$6.00 IN CHEQUE ☐ MONEY ORDER ☐

Remit to: FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA  
9934 - 106 Street, Edmonton, Alta.



Attacks against co-operatives have been made ever since co-operatives were begun.

With each era the attacks wear a new guise to cloak the real purpose—DESTROY CO-OPERATIVES!

## WHO IS ATTACKING CO-OPERATIVES

... and WHY?

Today it is alleged that "inequitable" taxation favors co-operatives. Organized attacks are carried on by the so-called *Equitable Income Tax Foundation*, the president of which is a top officer of the *Retail Merchant's Association of Canada*.

Who is paying the colossal sums for vast reams of propaganda against co-operatives in the current and most gigantic effort of its kind ever contrived in Canada?

Big, powerful, profit-business interests, through mergers, mass marketing methods and overpowering wealth have been the factor in the downfall of small, independent merchants of the past. NOW THEY ARE OUT TO CURB CO-OPERATIVES—the means by which society can protect itself from domination by powerful, monied interests—AND DOING IT UNDER THE PRETENSE OF PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE!

### THEY SAY . . .

... co-operatives are not paying a fair share of income tax.

BUT THE TRUTH IS that both co-ops and their members who are primary producers, pay income tax on co-op savings. "Taxation of co-operatives and that of corporations comes close to being equal when the 20 per cent dividend credit given corporate shareholders is considered," said a *Toronto Globe & Mail* writer in reporting on hearings before Canada's Royal Commission on Taxation.

### THEY SAY . . .

... co-operatives are "taking over" the economy of Canada,

BUT THE TRUTH IS that reports by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics disclose that there are only 849 retail co-operatives in Canada and they perform about 1% of Canada's total retail trade. Individual proprietorships and partnerships (generally 'small' businesses) account for 81% of the total retail outlets, but do only about 37% of the total retail business. Corporate chain stores account for but 18% of the retail outlets, but do almost 59% of Canada's retail business!

### THEY SAY . . .

... that tax avoidance" is the reason why co-operatives are growing—that they are really not opposed to co-operatives.

BUT THE TRUTH IS . . . the same and similar interests were attacking co-operatives LONG BEFORE THERE WAS AN INCOME TAX IN CANADA (it was first collected in 1918). Efforts to stop co-operative legislation . . . to have wholesales boycott co-operatives . . . to malign co-operatives in the eyes of the public . . . have dogged every step of co-operative progress in Canada!

Read the story that history relates!

### THE STORY . . .

#### 1906 AND EARLIER

The Federal Government granted charters to some early co-operatives; actively assisted co-operative creameries to form in what is now Alberta and Saskatchewan. A booklet of the Federal Government says: "Although some . . . early co-operatives survived . . . many failed or evolved into joint stock companies. They were handicapped by lack of appropriate legislation dealing with their incorporation and operation".

#### 1907

On December 3, a special committee of the House of Commons introduced for

consideration, *Bill No. 5, an Act Respecting Co-operation*. The Committee had given much study to co-operative legislation in other countries and the need for it in Canada. It presented a report of over 200 printed pages; the report was unanimous and fully endorsed the proposed legislation.

#### 1908

During discussion on Bill No. 5, the House of Commons was told that some retail merchants were opposed to the proposed co-operative legislation. Nevertheless, the Bill which would provide for incorporation of producer and consumer co-operatives and credit unions, under federal legislation, passed the House without one vote being cast against it!

#### 1908

On March 10, Bill No. 5 was referred to the Senate for approval. On March 24, it was referred for study to a Senate Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

#### 1908

The Senate Committee reported that some provinces objected to the Bill on grounds that it fell within provincial jurisdiction. The Committee suggested the Bill was not necessary. On the afternoon of July 15, the matter was discussed in the Senate, 56 of the little more than 100 members of the Senate being present. Discussion continued that evening, 47 senators then being present. Upon the vote being taken, 10 did not take part. Final result was, 18 for the Bill, 19 against!

"Thus the Senate of Canada threw out a Bill which had the unanimous endorsement of the House of Commons," said a writer of that day.

"The fate of that Bill was decided by less than 20% of the Senate," another writer recently said.

#### 1910

A Mr. Lloyd Harris, MP, introduced to the House of Commons another Bill which would provide for federal legislation respecting co-operatives. "A similar Bill passed the House of Commons in 1908 but in the Senate the Retail Merchants' Association opposed it as did the Ontario and Quebec governments, the former for personal reasons, the latter as an infringement of provincial rights," reads a journal of January 19, 1910.

#### 1910

A grocery trade magazine carried an editorial concerning the proposed co-operative legislation: "This Bill will not be in the interests of the retail trade and . . . will be . . . detrimental to grocers," it said. It urged merchants to unite and contact Members of Parliament in opposition to it. "A co-operative society working in every city or town will do much to separate the merchant and his customers," the editorial warned.

#### 1910

The Bill presented by Mr. Harris was referred to a Committee on Banking and Commerce for study and was "thrown out" in half an hour. The Bill "is being strenuously opposed by the Retail Merchants' Association. Its various branches are passing resolutions against the same, and individual merchants and their clerks are being admonished to write or interview their Members (of Parliament) in opposition," said a February 9, 1910 publication.

#### 1910

"The Retail Merchants' Association has been successful in killing the Co-operative Bill before the House of Commons . . . Following up their victory (they) now have a Bill before the Senate to provide for their own incorporation", a March, 1910 report reads.

#### 1913

Federal legislation now seemed unlikely, so co-operators of the prairie provinces then pinned hopes on provincial legislatures.

#### 1913

As provincial legislatures considered co-operative legislation, E. N. Trowern, secretary of the Dominion Retail Merchants' Association visited Saskatoon to address the local association: "Co-operatives 'are the greatest frauds that ever struck the community. The Grain Growers know no more about running a co-operative business than a cat knows of its grandmother . . . We have gone to the government from time to time opposing co-operative societies. I have never seen a honest co-operative store yet, and there has not been one found in Europe. They are a fraud from top to bottom. We have asked every wholesaler in the Dominion by letter what he thinks of the co-operative societies and if he sells to them we will cease doing business with him," a newspaper account of Mr. Trowern's address reads.

#### 1913

Provincial legislatures of Alberta and Saskatchewan passed co-operative legislation enabling true Rochdale-type co-operatives to be formed in these provinces.

#### 1913

Anti-co-op measures resulted in refusals of wholesales to supply consumer co-operatives or buying groups which farmers had formed. In twine, coal, and other lines, co-operators were shut off from supplies except through retail traders. In Brockville, Ont., a co-operative society had orders refused from three wholesalers. One of these wrote a letter: "Am sorry to say that according to a rule of Wholesale Grocers' Guild, we will be unable to supply you. Am sorry about this . . . but all members of the Guild are unable to sell to any co-operative society."

#### 1914

Its locals being refused supplies by wholesale houses, the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' was forced to set up a trading department for the procuring of farm supplies and foodstuffs for its members. Similar organizations in Alberta and Manitoba likewise became involved in this business even though they never intended to be commercial organizations.

#### 1917

### INCOME TAX INTRODUCED

As a wartime measure the Canadian Government, for the first time, instituted an Income Tax in Canada. ALL THE OPPOSITION TO CO-OPERATIVES RELATED THUS FAR OCCURRED BEFORE THERE WAS ANY SUCH THING AS AN INCOME TAX IN CANADA!

#### 1928-29

Co-operative Wholesales were begun in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, being formed by retail consumer co-operatives then existing. The co-operatives faced continuing problems in obtaining supplies, and in matters of price and quality of goods available to them.

#### 1940

The three prairie co-operative wholesales were making slow progress, being hampered by the Great Depression of the 1930's, and conditions brought about by World War II which followed. However, organizations had been set up, including Interprovincial Co-operatives, Canadian Co-operative Implements, credit unions, etc. All were small, but indicated the desire of co-operators to form organizations to serve themselves.

#### 1944

A Royal Commission on Co-operatives was established by the federal government to enquire into the present position of co-operatives with respect to the Income War Tax Act and the Excess Profit Tax Act, the organization and business methods and operations, etc.

#### 1945

The Royal Commission on Co-operatives held hearings all across Canada, receiving briefs opposing co-operatives from many organizations such as feed companies, independent fruit and vegetable processors, line elevator companies, retail merchants' groups, "The Income Tax Payers' Association," Boards of Trade, Western Retail Lumbermen's Ass'n, Canadian Automotive Wholesalers' Association. The co-operatives, of course, presented their case and as was to be expected, were subjected to very close examination by the Commissioners. All together, the commission received 175 briefs.

#### 1946

The Royal Commission's report on Co-operatives was accepted by the Federal Government. The present basis for taxation of co-operatives was enacted. Co-operatives pay income tax on whichever sum is greatest as a result of three separate calculations: 1) Surpluses arising from sales to non-members; 2) Monies set aside in reserves and thus not allocated to members as patronage refunds; 3) Three per cent of the capital employed in the enterprise. These regulations remain in effect and co-operatives abide by them!

Members of co-operatives include for personal income tax purposes, the patronage refunds received from co-operatives which arise from their purchases of goods used in farming, fishing or otherwise earning an income — and do so whether those refunds are received by them in cash or temporarily retained by their own democratic decision, in their co-operative.

#### 1959

A Royal Commission on Food Price Spreads in Canada tabled its reports on its findings in investigations of all segments of the food industry including farming, fishing, packing, processing, wholesaling and retailing. As one of its recommendations, this Royal Commission said: "WE RECOMMEND A FEDERAL STATUTE PROVIDING FOR THE INCORPORATION OF CO-OPERATIVES"!

#### 1960

Not long after the Royal Commission had presented its report, with its recommendation that a federal statute providing for incorporation of co-operatives be passed, vicious attacks against co-operatives began again. The Retail Merchants' Association, Line Elevators Association, Lumbermen's Association, and the Equitable Income Tax Foundation were among those involved.

#### 1965

The attacks against co-operatives still carry on!

### WHAT IS THE REAL ISSUE?

THE REAL ISSUE IS NOT TAXATION! The real issue is whether people should have a right to form co-operatives in which operating savings are returned to members as patronage refunds.

If co-operatives were the same as profit enterprise, transacting business for the sake of making a profit or return on investment as new income for a separate group of shareholders, there would be no argument!

But, co-operatives DO NOT OPERATE TO MAKE A PROFIT FOR A SEPARATE GROUP OF INVESTORS!

And note this:

- \* Co-operatives pay ALL forms of taxes including income tax.
- \* Apply democratic principles to business.
- \* Divide ownership, control, and wealth among many.
- \* Build and operate enterprises which are 100% Canadian owned—Keep Canadian wealth in Canada.
- \* Stimulate Canada's economy.
- \* Provide a voice for the greatest unorganized sector of today's society—consumers and Primary Producers.

Research and compiling of this information done by

FEDERATED CO-OPERATIVES LIMITED

Get in the Swing ... F.U.A. BONSPIEL March 9, 10, 11

At The Sportex In Edmonton



# Significant Development In U.S. Corporate Beef Production

By George Bickel, Editor, Rocky Mountain Union Farmer

Nearly 90 railroad cars were loaded recently with 3,600 head of feeder cattle here to make up the largest cattle shipment out of North Fork in the last 40 years.

The cattle were sold by the Gates Rubber Company from its 10,000-head herd now grazing on the company's 70,000-acre A-Bar-A and State Line Ranches to the Kern County (Calif.) Land Company, one of the nation's largest corporate farm and livestock operations.

The livestock were loaded at Walden, Colo., and shipped direct to the 40,000-head feed lots maintained by Kern County Land Company at Minatare, Nebraska.

The Union Pacific Railroad's Wyoming division traffic office at Cheyenne noted that the Gates Rubber Co. as seller and Kern County Land as buyer have also scheduled three other shipments to the Minatare feed lots.

Some 70 car loads left Encampment, Wyo. on September 28, 40 car loads from Northgate, and 25 car loads out of Walden and Lar- and on the 29th.

Ranch Manager Bill Phelps revealed that the Gates Rubber Co. plans the sale of 8,000 head to the Kern County Corporation during the fall. He did not disclose the selling price.

Kern County Land Company now owns holdings two times as large as Rhode Island, and is a major producer of livestock in Australia where they own both cattle and sheep operations. During the last few years they have sold upwards of 47,000 head of fat cattle per year from their Gosford, California feedyard near Bakersfield alone.

## CLASSIFIED ADS

### LIVESTOCK

LACOMBES: Boars and Glits. R.O.P. Guaranteed Breeders. Top Grades. E. W. Davies, R.R. 1, South Edmonton, Ph. 399-8207. .... 5

### FARM LANDS

LAND WANTED: 1/2 to 3/4 section mixed farm, good soil, good buildings. Box 632, Lethbridge, Alberta. #5216

Let the F.U.A. Income Tax Service

# Handle Your Worries

- WE GIVE GOOD SERVICE
- OUR RATES ARE LOW

And we can arrange to

# COME TO YOU

Write or Telephone

**F.U.A. Income Tax Service**

9934 - 106 Street, Edmonton, Alta.

Phone 424-0375

The Company also operates by lease the Boquillas Cattle Co. in northern Arizona comprising 129,000 acres.

The Kern County Land Co. is now interlocked with Safeway Stores, Inc. through the recent appointment of Kern County Board Member Ernest C. Arbuckle to the Safeway Board of directors. Through a recent purchase the

Company also now controls 51 percent of the stock of the J. I. Case tractor and implement company. It is also owner of the Walker Manufacturing Co. (automotive parts) and owner of some 1,550 producing oil and gas wells located on company land.

At present the giant land corporation lists as its most important asset 2,414,112 acres owned on the Pacific Coast and in the southwest. Its Minatare, Nebraska feeding operation was launched during the past 18 months.

(One can only question how much power the family farmer can have against these corporate "farmers".— Editor)

—Reprinted from Montana Farmers Union News.

## Dilemma Facing U.S. Livestock Producers

By George Bickel, Editor, Rocky Mountain Union Farmer

**WHAT HAS HAPPENED:** Livestock producers in America lost in excess of \$200,000,000 in 1963, and another half billion dollars the first quarter of 1964. Montana's share of this great loss has been roughly \$60,000,000 based on an estimated 25% loss on the normal \$166,000,000 earnings from cattle, part of \$243,000,000 annual livestock income.

**Why has this happened?**

1st—The livestock buildup: At the start of 1964 nation's cattle population was 106.5 million head, 3 million more than in 1963—15 million more than in 1958. That's 6% more than in 1962.

This isn't all bad at all for at current rates of population growth coupled with expansion of consumer purchasing power effective demand for beef is raising 2 to 3% per year.

Beef breeding herd expansion has been moving at twice this rate, however, 2 to 6%. Now 60% of the cow herd was 50% in 1953.

A second factor in the livestock buildup, even more damaging to supply gluts temporarily, than the actual increase in numbers, is

that of build-up in carcass weights. Many animals being fed to heavier weights with little thought given to the fact that when you add 100 pounds to each ten 1,000 pound steers you have added the equivalent of one more steer to the market glut.

A third factor responsible for this increasing supply problems is that caused from an increased holding back from slaughter of beef cows to beat the cost-price squeeze by getting one or two additional calves. (The more liberal capital gains benefit on cows and heifers in the income tax law put into effect in 1958 has also encouraged this trend.)

2nd—The problem of imports: Imports are an important factor influencing beef prices, but not as important as some would like to make them for obvious political reasons.

Although the United States is the world's largest importer of meat (360 million dollars) our exports of livestock and meat products were almost as large as imports.

We exported 347 million dollars worth of livestock and meat products in 1963—some 13 million dollars less than our imports.

At the same time we export some 6 billion dollars worth of agricultural commodities: \$1.2 billion worth of wheat (1 out of every 4 acres); \$977 million worth of feed grains, etc.

**Who are the import culprits?**

Who is doing the importing? To hear the Colorado Governor give a political speech you would think that Lyndon B. Johnson was personally doing it, or that the government was. The government doesn't import, only the sellers of beef at retail, and the processors of carcass beef, the large corporate feeders, and even some border state ranchers do the importing.

Campbell Soup Company, whose president is a confirmed enemy of government supply programs, supported the strongest lobby in Colorado recently against foreign beef labeling.

3rd Problem: The concentration of buying power in the hands of the Chain Stores, and the encroachment of large corporations into ranching and feeding.

Of all the problems faced by livestock producers the most significant by far lies in this area.

1. The corporate cattle feeder

## BULLETIN BOARD

A short summary of Farm Organization Doings in the Province of Alberta during the next three weeks.

**JR. DEBATE DEADLINE:** All entries must be in the mail by March 13.

**EDMONTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE Annual Short Course** — February 16, 17, 18 at Edmonton Sportex on "How to Live with Automation."

**8th ANNUAL RURAL LEADERSHIP COURSE** — Banff School of Fine Arts, February 22 to March 5.

### DISTRICT CONVENTIONS

Districts 13 and 14 hold their conventions in March. The dates are:

District 13 — Tuesday, March 16th at Medicine Hat.

District 14 — Wednesday, March 17th at Lethbridge.

Be sure to send your full quota of delegates. You are allowed one delegate for each 10 members or major portion thereof. Visitors are welcome.

### MEETINGS ARRANGED AND/OR PARTICIPATED IN BY F.U. & C.D.A.

**Workshop on role and function of Co-ops in the community** — in relation to each other, and to other groups. At Stony Plain February 19; and at Barrhead on February 22. Sponsored by F.U. & C.D.A. with assistance of County Team Committee. Staff to include Harold Webber of Coop Activities Branch, Fenn Cline of Federated Co-op, Gerald Schuler of F.U. & C. D.A., Herb Kotscherofski and Clare Anderson of F.U.A.

**Workshop for District Officials** — on communication and function of committees within an organization — and the new farm organization proposal. In Olds February 17 for District 10. Staff includes Stan Chapman from U. of A. Calgary Department of Extension, Kay Dowhaniuk of F.U. & C.D.A. Sponsored by F.U. & C.D.A.

**County Team Organization Meeting** — County of Rocky View. To be held in Calgary Co-op Shopping Centre February 23.

**County of Mountain View** — Workshop for local and Sub District officials. March 9 at Didsbury.

### F.U.A. INCOME TAX CLINICS

February 15th — WESTLOCK

February 18th — TOFIELD

February 19th — HARDISTY

February 22nd — GALAHAD

SEND YOUR BULLETIN BOARD NOTICES AT LEAST TWO WEEKS IN ADVANCE.

and rancher: We have witnessed a rash of corporate entry into cattle feeding since Korea, some by chain stores themselves, but most by large corporations who sometimes integrated through contract with both chains or packers or both.

It is from these lots (some large enough to handle 120,000 head a year—43,000 head at one time) that much of the problem we discussed under carcass build-up is occurring.

Examples: Monfort in Colorado—the largest in the world—43,000 head now on feed; Coors Beer Co. in Colorado—10,000-20,000; Far Farms—35,000 head; American Tea Co.—75,000 head; National Stores (Acme)—35,00 head estimate; Winn-Dixie Stores—70,000 acre ranches in Colorado; Kern County Land Co.—Feedlots in Nebraska, California and Arizona; sheep holdings in Australia and New Zealand. (plan to buy Case Tractor Company).

**Such large corporations now control more than 60% of all fat cattle on feed in Colorado** and they are responsible for a greater percentage of the cattle being over fed there.

**How do these corporations affect the price of beef?**

How do these corporations affect the price of beef? They do it in these ways: 1. beating down the price of feedstuffs, 2. destroying competition, and 3. using political influence.

Montfort & Farr, on the National Livestock Advisory committee, advised against selling at lighter weights.

In beating down the price of feeders, large commercial feeder E. Howard Hill has said: "Every cattle feeder should raise his right hand, put his left on the Bible and swear that he's not going to pay more than 15 cents a pound for choice yearling steers and 18 cents for the best steer calves

available this fall.

"The feeder, year after year, has paid too much for his cattle."

This same Mr. Hill is also past president of the Iowa Farm Bureau.

**Through their concentration of buying and marketing power chain stores are able to "fix" or "administer" prices.** Within-store competition can be directed at will. For example, 26c poultry—all from integrated broiler plants—can be against beef during height of "so-called" beef promotion. Highly processed meats are pushed and these delicatessen items carry as much as 40% profit.

—Reprinted from Montana Farmers Union News.

## Stone Removal Is Pool Aim

Small stones in threshed grain have resulted in considerable loss to the farmer and delay in the movement of some grain.

As pointed out on various occasions by the Canadian Board of Grain Commissioners, small stones cause great damage to milling machinery and as a result, all grain containing them is rejected and must be cleaned at the terminals through special equipment.

### Leave No Trace

Contrary to a statement appearing in the last issue of The Organized Farmer, to the effect that stones could not be removed at Vancouver, the most up-to-date stone removal equipment found any place is in the the Pool Terminal at that port. We believe most other Vancouver terminals also have stone removers. Many tons of small rock fragments are removed from grain each year at the Pool terminal but this is a slow and costly operation, as the job must be thorough and no trace left in the grain.